

confers with the petitioner, tacitly approves the filing of the petition, confers with the court on the filing of the petition and yet does not affix its name to the petition, I leave then the question of their participating to the committee. In my opinion, they have participated.

Mr. EDMONDSON. You say you feel this is false because it conceals the fact that of involvement in the discussions of the action to be taken and knowledge of it?

Mr. CLEARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I see. Go ahead, sir. I just wanted to get your statement clear on that point.

Mr. CLEARY. Fine. The second point—these first two are relatively minor, but the second point appears on page 7 of the report wherein Mr. Cox, or the report, refers to the Department conducting a truncated investigation of certain activities.

My classification of falsehood is in reference to the word “truncated.” Undersecretary of the Interior Carver stated that—in a letter dated July 9, 1963 just what kind of investigation the Department of the Interior did conduct when it was asked by Congress to conduct an exhaustive investigation so that they could come forth with an “enlightened opinion,” and it was after one year of investigation that Undersecretary of the Interior Carver came forth with his recommendations.

The next point that I believe to be false appears on page 8.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Then, the word you object to in there is “truncated”?

Mr. CLEARY. Instead of exhaustive.

Mr. EDMONDSON. How do you define “truncated”?

Mr. CLEARY. Short, abbreviated.

Mr. EDMONDSON. And, you feel that they did not conduct a short abbreviated hearing, but conducted a rather extensive or exhaustive investigation?

Mr. CLEARY. Undersecretary of the Interior Carver, if he is to be believed in his letter of July 9, 1963, yes, sir. Do you care to have me read that portion of the letter, or the report? I refer to it on my page 9.

Mr. TUNNEY. Your page 9?

Mr. CLEARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Do you have the full text of Mr. Carver's letter? If so, we can place it in the record, if we do.

Mr. CLEARY. I believe it is part of the exhibit of the task force, Your Honor.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I don't know if I can read this copy of Mr. Udall's letter that responded to Mr. Dawson's original request in 1962; it's illegible in the copy that has been supplied to me, and if you gentlemen have been supplied copies that are also illegible, you have my sympathy.

Mr. CLEARY. The copy I have is legible.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The one dated July 9, 1963, which has been supplied to us looks even less legible than the previous one.

Mr. CLEARY. May I supply that to the committee?

Mr. EDMONDSON. If you have a copy, we'd like to look at it.

Mr. CLEARY. Yes, sir. Would you like to look at it at this time?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Yes, we'd like to look at it.